

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address. COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box. 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.napto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/841,289	04/24/2001	Scott Lee Wellington	5659-07000/EBM	4722	
7590 01/06/2004			EXAM	EXAMINER	
DEL CHRISTENSEN			GRIFFIN, WALTER DEAN		
SHELL OIL COMPANY P. O. BOX 2463			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
HOUSTON, TX 77252-2463			1764		

DATE MAILED: 01/06/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.	Applicant(s)			
09/841,289	WELLINGTON ET AL.			
Examiner	Art Unit			
Walter D. Griffin	1764			

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 11 December 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

⊨xam	mination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	
	PERIOD FOR REPLY [check	either a) or b)]
a) [b) [= ' ' ' 	2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no 3 from the mailing date of the final rejection.
have be 37 CFR (b) abov	Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the peen filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corr FR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period bove, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the middle patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	esponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in
1.	A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)),	
2.	The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:	
(a	(a) they raise new issues that would require further considerate	ion and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b)	(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);	
(c)	 (c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form issues for appeal; and/or 	n for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the
(d	(d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding. NOTE:	oonding number of finally rejected claims.
3.	Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):	
4.	Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	e if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment
5.🖂	☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for reconsiders application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Output Description D	
6.	The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is no raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	t directed SOLELY to issues which were newly
7.	For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected.	
	The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	
	Claim(s) allowed:	
	Claim(s) objected to:	
	Claim(s) rejected:	
	Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	
8.[_]	The drawing correction filed on is a) ☐ approved or b)[disapproved by the Examiner.
9.	Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1	449) Paper No(s)
10.	☐ Other:	
		Welt_D. Duff_
		Walter D. Griffin Primary Examiner
		Art Unit: 1764

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303) 09/841,289

Application No.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: of the reasons of record in the Final Rejection mailed on October 17, 2003 and because applicant has not provided any evidence that distinguishes the claimed product from the product disclosed by Terry.